IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicants:	Robert J. Rappold III	§	Art Unit:	2169
Serial No.:	10/657,916	§	Confirmation No.:	5111
Filed:	09/09/2003	§	Examiner:	Dung K. Chau
For:	EXTENSIBLE AGENT SYSTEM AND METHOD	§	Atty. Dkt. No.:	200901148-5 (HPC.0836US)

Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

REPLY BRIEF

Sir:

The following sets forth Appellant's Reply to the Examiner's Answer dated November 13, 2009.

In the final rejection, the Examiner conceded that Ivanov fails to disclose the following elements of claim 1:

- dynamically selecting at least a portion of a plurality of agent components based on the client request and the environment characteristics, the at least a portion of the plurality of agent components being selected using a relational knowledgebase that comprises a properties table of properties for dynamic agent component selection and an actions table of actions for processing; and

- processing the client request using the selected agent components and according to one or more actions of the actions table that are planned and scheduled.

3/2/2009 Office Action at 3. However, the Examiner incorrectly cited Britton as purportedly disclosing the claimed subject matter missing from Ivanov. *Id.* at 3-4.

As argued by the Appellant in the Appeal Brief, contrary to the assertion by the Examiner, Britton fails to disclose or hint at dynamically selecting at least a portion of a plurality

of agent components based on a client request and environment characteristics, where the at least

a portion of the plurality of agent components is selected using a relational knowledgebase that

comprises a properties table of properties for dynamic agent component selection **and an actions**

table of actions for processing.

The Response to Arguments section of the Examiner's Answer cited the following

passages of Britton as further purported support for the rejection: column 3, lines 24-53; column

7, lines 23-33; column 10, lines 31-67.

As explained by Britton, multiple versions of a program component are available, and a

specific version can be dynamically selected from the available versions based on current values

of changeable attributes. Britton, 3:44-49. Selecting a program component dynamically is based

upon a user's authorization privileges, current working environment, preferences, network

connection type, status, or some combination of the foregoing. *Id.*, 3:49-53. Britton also notes

that the values of the changeable attributes can be provided from a number of sources, including

the user, configuration mechanisms of a user's machine, a network gateway, or a network

database.

The column 7 passage of Britton cited by the Examiner refers to software that

dynamically selects and downloads components that operate on a server in the network, as one or

more modules that are invoked in response to a request for a component sent to the server by a

client.

Neither of the passages of Britton cited above by the Examiner in the Response to

Arguments section of the Examiner's Answer provide any hint of the foregoing subject matter of

claim 1 noted by Appellant.

The column 10 passage of Britton cited by the Examiner refers to a predicate 703 that is defined for a component 701. The cited column 10 passage goes on to describe further details of a predicate record. However, this passage of Britton also provides no hint of dynamically selecting at least a portion of a plurality of agent components based on a client request and environment characteristics, where the at least a portion of the plurality of agent components is selected using a relational knowledgebase that comprises a properties table of properties for dynamic agent component selection **and an actions table of actions for processing**.

For the foregoing reasons and the reasons set forth in the Appeal Brief, it is clear that the hypothetical combination of Ivanov and Britton would not have led to the claimed invention.

The remaining arguments set forth in the Examiner's Answer have been rebutted by Appellant in the Appeal Brief.

Therefore, reversal of all rejections is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: <u>January 12, 2010</u>   <u>   /Dan C. Hu/   </u>
Dan C. Hu
Registration No. 40,025
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
1616 South Voss Road, Suite 750
Houston, TX 77057-2631
Telephone: (713) 468-8880
Facsimile: (713) 468-8883